Vol. IX, No. 22 HUMAN EVENTS May 28, 1952

TREATIES CAN BE TRAPS

By William Henry Chamberlin

During and since the War, American foreign policy has suffered from an acute attack of a disease which might be described as treatyitis. It has been assumed that the more treaties, agreements, covenants, declarations, etc., we could conclude with foreign nations the better it would be for our national interests and for the cause of world peace.

William C. Bullitt, one of Roosevelt's court favorites until his anti-Communist views made him fall from popularity, testified in a magazine article that one of Roosevelt's primary aims was "to persuade Stalin to adhere to statements of general aims, like the Atlantic Charter". This was not a difficult aim to realize. Stalin was always willing to sign any declaration of abstract principles, so long as his very concrete objectives of annexation and expansion were not affected.

So an unreal barter of substance for shadow set in with the Declaration of the United Nations on January 1, 1942, and reached its climax at Yalta in February, 1945. Was Stalin showing a clear intention of obtaining from Roosevelt and Churchill all, and more than all, the territorial spoils which he had obtained in his deal with Hitler in August, 1939? But he had signed, several times, the noble principles of the Atlantic Charter. Had he broken off relations with the legitimate representative government of Poland and built up a Red Quisling government, ready made for imposition on Poland as soon as the Red Army entered that country? But he was always prepared to say that he wanted a "strong independent Poland" and had even been known to utter benevolent sentiments about the Four Freedoms.

This trade of substance for shadow went to almost incredible lengths at Yalta. On the face of it the territorial arrangements sanctioned at Yalta were a flagrant and unmistakable violation of the Atlantic Charter, with its emphasis on the right of peoples to self-determination. Almost half of Poland's pre-war territory was handed over to the Soviet Union and Poland was promised large, indefinite acquisitions of German territory. But the Yalta Declaration is spattered with pious professions of respect for the Atlantic Charter.

The Yalta arrangements set the stage for what happened in Poland later: the transformation of that formerly independent country, proud of its western culture and civilization, into an outlying Soviet province. But Roosevelt and his apologists were hypno-

Copyright 1952 by Human Events, Inc.
Published weekly at 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tized by such nice sounding phrases in the Yalta Agreements as "free and unfettered elections", "democratic institutions of their own choice", etc.

ONE MIGHT HAVE imagined that the makers of our foreign policy would have been cured of this disease of treatyitis by the devastating lessons of postwar experience. The Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms soon became byword and mockery. There was not the slightest consideration for the wishes of the peoples in the frontiers which were drawn in eastern and central Europe. And one could search diligently without finding a trace of the Four Freedoms in the areas of the world which are under Communist control — areas which expanded immensely after the late war.

It is now obvious that many, perhaps most, of our wartime commitments about the shape of the peace to come should never have been made. The decision at Cairo to transfer Formosa to China has now become acutely embarrassing. There was no suggestion of consulting the Formosans, who enjoyed much better living conditions as part of the Japanese Empire than their racial kinsmen on the mainland of China. And it would be a betrayal of the vital strategic interests of the United States to hand over Formosa to a Communist Chinese regime that has given every sign of being implacably hostile to this country.

Then there was the often announced resolution that Germany and Japan should never possess armed forces again. This is distinctly awkward at a time when effective European and Far Eastern defense plans depend substantially on the willingness of the Germans and the Japanese to make a military contribution. Many Germans and Japanese now show a tendency to take us at our word on this matter of permanent disarmament.

However, the naive idea that it was somehow a great triumph for peace, democracy and world order, if the Soviet Government could be induced to attach its signature to some kind of international agreement, died extremely hard. Indeed, it is not yet dead, as is evident from the action of President Truman in recommending the UN International Covenant on Human Rights for ratification by the Senate.

A good example of the proposition that an agreement with a Communist regime is always a "heads-you-win-tails-I-lose" proposition was furnished not long ago when the Soviet Government, in a note to the United States, protested against an appropriation in the Mutual Security Act designed to aid refugee groups from the Soviet Union and its satellites. The Soviet note invoked an agreement concluded between Roosevelt and the then Soviet Foreign Commissar Litvinov on the eve of establishment of diplomatic relations between Washington and Moscow.

Each party to this agreement agreed to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group aiming at the overthrow of the other government. If words had any meaning, the conclusion of this agreement should have been followed by the expulsion of the Communist International from Soviet territory. But the Comintern continued

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to do business at the old stand for ten more years. Its dissolution in 1943 altered nothing in the systematic utilization of foreign Communist parties as fifth columns by the Soviet Government.

As this is only one of many proofs of the rule that the word of the Soviet Government in international affairs is worthless, the obvious moral would seem to be to conclude no mutual obligations with that Government. Whenever we have transgressed this rule, as we often have during the last decade, it has been to our disadvantage.

AT FIRST SIGHT it might seem that only a churlish curmudgeon would balk at signing something so apparently laudable as an international covenant on human rights. But this is the reasoning of the individual who joins every front organization that sports in its title some such word as democratic, progressive, liberal or anti-fascist.

It is important to remember that, under Article VI of our Constitution, "All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding."

It is clear, therefore, that a treaty, or international agreement of any kind, is a serious obligation. Its phrasing should be carefully examined. Now on such vital issues as freedom of religion, and of speech and press, there are important divergences between the UN Covenant on Human Rights and the Constitution of the United States. Freedom of religion under the latter is simple and absolute, a natural right which no government is authorized to withhold or limit or modify. The Bill of Rights says:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The language of the Covenant on this subject is much vaguer and is hedged with qualifications, which could easily be abused by a dictatorship intent on persecuting some type of religion, or all religions:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are necessary to protect public safety, order, health or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

The Bill of Rights in the Constitution simply forbids Congress from making any law "abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press". The Covenant again goes into longwinded qualifications, which could easily serve the purposes of dictatorship:

"The right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities and restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or of the rights, freedom or reputations of others."

As Senator John W. Bricker* has said: "The addiction for multilateral agreements is one of the outstanding vices of Administration foreign policy."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two striking examples are the efforts to work out a multilateral agreement on freedom of press and information and another setting up the ITO or International Trade Organization. The convention on freedom of the press was so badly distorted by the time it had passed through the mill of discussion in UN committees and subcommittees that the United States is now eager to bury it. The final text, far from assuring freedom of international reporting, or alleviating the blackout in the Iron Curtain countries and the dimout in some Asian and Latin American lands, would have actually authorized censorship in some cases and made the harassed life of the international journalist still more harassed.

The ITO agreement, advocated as a means of freeing the channels of international trade, emerged from the Havana conference so loaded with weasel words and escape clauses that American business opinion is now generally opposed to ratification.

TREATIES and international conventions can be traps. Mutual obligation agreements with Communist regimes have invariably proved to be bear traps. It is high time to get away from the illusion of "One World" and from the dangerous delusion that we can improve the prospects of human rights in other parts of the world by giving up the conception, imbedded in the Declaration of Independence and Constitution, that certain rights and liberties are natural and inalienable and not subject to government interference, tampering or restriction. A program of action, designed to reverse the dangerous trend toward selling historic American principles for a mess of internationalist pottage, should include the following points:

The Yalta and Potsdam agreements should be declared null and void, on the double ground that they are intrinsically immoral and contrary to American ideals of justice and humanity and that the Soviet Union has ignored those phases of the agreements which it has found inconvenient.

The Roosevelt-Litvinov agreement should be nullified, on the ground that it has long been violated, in spirit and letter, by the Soviet Union.

The Senate should refuse to ratify the UN Covenant on Human Rights in its present form and reaffirm its faith in the philosophy of the Constitution, with its many "Thou Shalt Nots", addressed to the State.

There should be a constitutional amendment assuring that no American citizen may be deprived of any of his constitutional rights by virtue of any treaty or international convention or executive agreement.

---

* As we go to press, hearings are being held by a Senate judiciary subcommittee on Senator Bricker's proposed constitutional amendment protecting American sovereignty and constitutional rights against encroachment by the UN, or any other international organization, treaty or executive agreement.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. IX, No. 22 — Wednesday, May 28, 1952 — Washington, D. C.

JUN '52

MacArthur and Taft: It can now be definitely stated that General MacArthur is completely and wholeheartedly on the side of Senator Taft in the present campaign.

It is necessary to reiterate this, because various Administration columnists have been saying for some time that this was not so sure, that the General was really playing his own game to the end that he might win the nomination at the Convention as a dark horse. Indeed, some in the Taft camp privately talked in worried terms about the situation. Finally, a little flurry occurred which, however, was found to possess no substance whatsoever.

Fearing that there might be some question of the close relations between the General and the Senator, friends of Taft consulted the General — we learn this from knowledgable sources in New York. But what MacArthur had to say removed any of the Taft apprehensions and the meeting ended in a clearer understanding than previously.

The General surprised and gratified the Taft friends beyond all their hopes. MacArthur placed himself completely at the service of the Senator's cause, offering to speak in behalf of Taft and to back him to the limit at the Convention. One point especially pleased the Taft friends: the General volunteered the opinion that the defense budget of the U.S., if properly handled, could be cut between $20 and $25 billions — an estimate which amply supports the thesis which Taft has upheld in recent speeches.

It is emphasized — among those who attended the conference — that the General asked for absolutely no reward. Friends of the General, however, believe that he expects a reward; and no one who knows Taft doubts that the Senator, if elected, would be eager to offer it to him. It would be the mission of completely reshaping our whole defense system and strategy and, as a by-product, the cleaning out of the Pentagon, root and branch.

Disunity as Usual: The so-called "unified" Defense Department is displaying its customary three-way (Army vs. Air Force vs. Navy) conflict — with a new bone to scramble over — atomic power. The Army wants to control atomic military power so as to use it in artillery fire, a dispersed and highly expensive employment of the highly expensive nuclear energy. The Navy wants atomic bombs for delivery from aircraft carriers. And the Air Force wants it for delivery of atomic bombs by ground-based, long-range "strategic" airplanes. The fight is furious, but cynical observers predict that the battle will end in a "cutting of the pie" — a division of funds among all three services, by mutual compromise. This, of course, will place a hard burden on the taxpayer. But, it will undoubtedly be hailed as a triumph of "the unified defense services".

The "pie-cutting" lies at the root of the fight between the Defense Department and the House of Representatives in recent weeks. The House, by a piece of limiting legislation, cut about $4½ billions from the budget requests by the Defense Department. There is little doubt that this cut might well prove eventually dangerous to the defense of the country. But, since the services refuse really to unify and to produce a reasonable defense system which would be supportable by a reasonable defense budget, the legislators could find no other alternative than the "meat-ax". The legislators are subject to criticism, but less so than the generals and admirals — and their civilian superiors — who bear the main responsibility.

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democrats in GOP Primaries: The example of the fight within the Texas GOP Convention highlights this matter, and we have no doubt that the regular GOP officials in that state were well within their rights in repelling an invading host of Democrats. Still, you cannot really understand the situation until you see it.

We saw it at a meeting in our precinct in Washington, in the GOP primaries held here last week to elect delegates for a District of Columbia Republican convention. There the "Republicans-for-a-day" appeared in force, including a number of individuals whom we recognized as having held jobs for many years in the New and Fair Deal governments. They were out to defeat what they called the "Old Guard" and to nominate a soldier who, like themselves, had voted Democratic. Only a neighbor in a community could spot them, and properly interpret their applause for speeches in favor of Ike. After many years of familiarity with the Aesopian or double-talk language of left-wingers, we were able to understand the things said by strange people, so strangely in a strange primary.

[A Texas subscriber happened in on us just as we were writing the above, and remarked that this description fitted well the precinct convention he had attended in West Texas just a few weeks previously.]

Taft won 39 out of 43 precincts in the District of Columbia GOP primaries and so at the District convention six delegates who favor Taft will be given credentials to the Chicago convention. Even the Democrats who "crossed over" had to admit they were fairly beaten and were clearly non-plussed by the great outpouring of voters (five times as many as in 1948).

What obviously happened was this: The Ike forces, as usual, made so much noise that Taft supporters were spurred to come out in large numbers. Among the latter were many (maybe most of them) who had never voted in the D. C. primary at all. To use Sen. Taft's own description, the formerly "uninterested voters" — after a decade of discouraging "me-tooism" — smelled a real fight and went to the polls in commanding numbers. It could be a portent — if Taft is nominated.

UN: Senator McCarran (Democrat, Nevada), Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, addressed the following statement to his Committee on May 22: "I made an error which I shall regret all the days of my life when I voted for the United Nations." (As reported by the Washington *Times-Herald*, page 1, May 24.)

Point Four Grows: As frequently predicted in these columns in recent years, the relatively small appropriation for Point IV, "for technical advice", was simply a placating maneuver, to get the Point IV organization started, to enable it to "insert its foot in the door". Later, we forecasted, the bureaucratic demands of the Point IV organization would grow, with a vast international WPA as the end result.

Last week, Congressman Lawrence Smith rose in the House of Representatives (on May 23) and pointed out that whereas Point IV "was designed to buy technical knowledge and assistance" for underdeveloped countries, "now they have gone far beyond that proposition. It is not only a matter of furnishing a few men but an endless number of projects never contemplated when the Point IV program was considered." He revealed that a host of "teams" of persons from many foreign countries has been transported on visits to the U.S. to get "advice"; and that large bills for "supplies and equipment" are run up to inaugurate "a great WPA project on a global scale".

The Congressman disclosed that 505 teams from 15 European countries and 33 teams from 6 Far Eastern countries were sponsored during the calendar year 1951; and that the cost of this wholesale travel ran to over $7 million. Mr. Smith read into the Record (May 23, pp. 5969-72) a long list of these teams and the truly amazing number of projects which they were studying. For instance, twenty-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

five teams for Belgium and Luxemburg had 25 projects of which "potato root eelworm control and eradication" is one and "National income statistics study" is another. And he went on to show that the Point IV program proposed for Ethiopia calls for 16 U.S. technicians costing $64,000 in salaries and supplies and equipment costing $478,150. Thus, supplies multiply the originally estimated cost of Point IV.

Smith then introduced and the House passed an amendment limiting the amount of supplies and equipment for Point IV projects.

Buchananism Revived: Nearly two years ago, the infamous Buchanan Committee redefined "lobbying" as any "substantial effort" to influence legislation. If that definition had been legislatively activated, HUMAN EVENTS and every other advocate of legal limitations on government power could have been put under Executive ban.

Last Tuesday, President Truman demonstrated that Buchananism is not dead. He lashed out against the campaigns conducted by private power companies against the efforts of the government to put us into the power business. He spoke to the delegates of the Electric Consumers Conference. (Our delegate, although we consume some electricity, was not invited; was yours?) He promised to see whether the Corrupt Practices Act could not be used to restrain the "pernicious political activities" of businessmen who are trying to save their enterprises from extinction by unfair socialized competition.

It is all wrong, thought the President, for private power companies to spend "millions and millions" to show up the inadequacies of socialized power projects. He did not say a word about the many more millions of taxpayers' money being spent by the bureaucracy to "sell" themselves, including socialized power projects, to the country. After all, the power companies are spending their own money.

Hoosier Hustings: Throughout the country, the revolt against centralized government and the welfare state has been voiced in the various primary contests. For instance, in that highly individualistic commonwealth, Indiana, we have come across the following manifestations of this trend.

One of the candidates for GOP nomination as Governor of Indiana is Samuel Harrell of the small city of Noblesville. He is fighting on a platform which proposes to return to townships, cities and counties all authority now held by the state of Indiana which can be performed as well or better and more economically on the local levels. This is in harmony with the Hoosier trend which appeared in the famous Jenner amendment (described in this column, October 3, 1951). Jenner at that time successfully altered the Federal Social Security law so that the states could effectively eliminate waste of money on relief and social benefits.

In another part of Indiana, we discover a GOP candidate for the state legislature running on an anti-Social Security platform. He is Mr. David Stouffer of South Bend, a small businessman who not long ago refused to pay the self-employment S.S. tax for 1951, after writing Secretary of the Treasury Snyder that Social Security is a "farce". Stouffer wants people to vote for him, not in any expectation that he can do something about the Federal social security system as an Indiana legislator, but just as a protest against the institution itself.

Education Front: *Your Child Is Their Target* is the title of an article by Irene Corbally Kuhn, in which this noted journalist tells the amazing story of our educational system, how it was turned into an instrument for creating a socialistic society. Every parent, every American, should read it. (A copy can be had for $.15 from the Guardians for American Education, Inc., 225 Fifth Ave., New York 10, N. Y.) Irene Kuhn has done it again. Her piece in the *American Legion Magazine* of over a year ago exposed the pro-Red tendencies in the book review business, inspired a real campaign to reform that evil and — judging by the results today — has put the enemy very much on the defensive.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Economics for All: Why should a professor of economics find it necessary to appeal to a wider audience than that furnished him by his university? Why should he want to write a book on economics for the general public? It is a justifiable inference that he does so because either his classroom offers him an uncongenial atmosphere, or his departmental confreres are hostile to his ideas. He feels like a maverick because he is unfashionable, and goes to the public outside the campus to get a hearing. He appeals to the "academic freedom" that prevails in the free market place and not in the colleges.

Within the past month two eminent professors of economics have taken their wares to the public. Dr. William A. Paton, of the University of Michigan, offers his very readable *Shirtsleeve Economics* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., $4.00) and Dr. Lewis H. Haney, of New York University, continuing the work of his newspaper column, brings forth his *How You Really Earn Your Living* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., paper bound $1.50; cloth bound $3.00).

It is sufficient, in the short space at our disposal, to say that both books, while distinctly different in style and treatment, are clear, concise statements of the case for the free market. They both assert that the government is a non-producer and therefore has no other competence in the economic business of a nation than to maintain order. They both insist that the wealth of a nation is in proportion to its productive capacity, not to the profligacy of the government. The market place, they hold, is the automatic regulator of all economic processes, operating without regard to the conceit of politicians; political intervention in the market place, they aver, can only result in a lowering of the national production. Both professors are for free trade, domestically and internationally, and both insist on a standard of money free from the whims of government officials. In short, both books are decidedly in opposition to the "controlled economy" ideas that presently dominate our college economics courses.

But, why were these books written and published? Why did the professors bait their pens with a polemical style, abandoning the severe phraseology of the textbook, and why are they so anxious to brighten abstract theories with illustrations taken from the current scene? Why are they intent on winning the non-collegiate student? Professor Paton, who hits hard throughout his book, gives the answer thus: "The extent of the present-day uncritical acceptance of misleading slogans and unsound policies is undoubtedly due to the invasion of the American schoolroom — at all levels — by the apostles of Marx and their sympathizers."

So, it is necessary for conscientious professors to engage the public in a fight to liberate the classroom from these invaders. They come to the literate public with a warning: Since your sons and daughters are being indoctrinated, not taught, in the colleges, it is necessary that you acquaint yourself with the principles of economics so that you can effectively counteract this indoctrination; and simply because you can read, you can readily grasp these principles, which we present to you herewith without academic jargon. We are putting in your hands the demonstrable facts of economics which are being suppressed by those who have monopolized the college classroom, so that you can offset the influence of this indoctrination in the field of public affairs. There is the hope, too, that your acquaintance with these principles will ultimately unseat the classroom monopolists.

Both books deserve wide reading. Dr. Haney is most effective, we think, in his clear analysis of government bonds, and in his disposing of the notion that wars are paid for by future generations. Dr. Paton is at his best in ably and ruthlessly debunking bureaucratic economics. But, it is hard to make a choice. The debt of the public to these intrepid professors can only be paid off by the generous placing of their books in the hands of students.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1136 Eighteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change in address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED